

Remarks

The present application includes claims 1-39. Claims 1-39 have been rejected by the Examiner. By this Response, claims 1-7, 14-15, and 21 have been amended, and new claims 40-45 have been added.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended *inter alia* to add that:

- 1) There are at least certain different feature images displayed on the remote display';
- 2) 'Feature images displayed on the remote display during play of the feature game represent that there are a plurality of possible outcomes of the feature game'; and
- 3) The determination of a feature outcome for of the gaming machines fix a subsequent determination of a feature outcome for another one of the gaming machines.'

Support for these amendments can be found, for example:

- In Figures 4 to 10 and the description of these Figures, which disclose different images being displayed on a display of the gaming machine and a remote display;
- On page 9, line 29 to page 10, line 5, which describes a group in which a fixed set of prizes is randomly distributed; and
- At page 11, lines 11 to 25, which describes the removal of a prize in one feature game resulting in the random distribution of the outcomes available for subsequent plays of the feature game.

Claim 2 has been amended to add that: 'the feature outcome for each of the gaming machines is dependent on both a selection made by a player during play of the feature game and any earlier determinations of a feature outcome on another one of the

active gaming machines.' Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 14 to 17, which describe the selection by a player of a position that reveals the prize to be awarded from the feature game.

Claim 4 has been amended to add that: ' the icons being selectable by the player to directly affect both the content of the feature images on the second display and the at least certain different feature images on the remote display'. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, at page 9, lines 21 to 28 and at page 10, lines 9 to 13.

Claim 5 has been amended to add that: the selection [associated with the feature game] affecting which one of the plurality of different outcomes occurs in the feature game, and wherein the same selections are available at each of the gaming machines when the feature game is played'. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 11, lines 11 to 17, which describes the ability for the same place on the island 68 to be selected by two different players.

Support for the amendments made to claims 3, 6, 7, 14, 15 and 21 can be found, for example, in the sections referred to above,

New claims 40 to 45 have been added. Support for claims 40 to 43 can be found, for example, in Figures 4 to 10 and the description of these Figures. Support for claims 44 and 45 can be found, for example, on page 11, lines 3 to 10.

Reference is made herein below to the claims as amended.

Claim Rejections

35 USC § 103

The examiner has rejected claims 1-39 as unpatentable over US 6,416,409 (Jordan) and US 20030220139 (Peterson).

Claims 1 and 21

The Applicant understands the examiner's view in paragraph 6 of the office action to be that:

1) The abstract of Peterson describes cooperation between feature images on a display of a gaming machine and feature images on a remote display to determine a feature outcome; and

2) Claim 1 (and other claims) does not involve an inventive step over the combination of this description with Jordan.

For the reasons below, the Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Peterson describes the display of 'current or historical jackpot winning information from the gambling machine'. This information in no way 'cooperates' with feature images on a display of the gaming machine. In contrast, by their very nature, current or historical information can only describe what has occurred on the gaming machine.

Furthermore, the 'current or historical jackpot winning information from the gambling machine' is not described as being used in the communication of a feature outcome on a gaming machine. Again, by describing what has occurred on the gaming machine, the information by its very nature can not be an active part of the information that communicates the determination of the feature game.

Therefore, it is submitted that Peterson fails to disclose anything to the skilled addressee that would lead the skilled addressee to modify the teaching in Jordan to

provide feature images on both a gaming machine display and a remote display that cooperate and which communicate a feature outcome on a gaming machine.

The examiner says that it would be obvious to incorporate Peterson's teachings to provide a centralized display means to all players, and that the centralized display displays current jackpot and gaming information such as bonus symbols and the current pool and amounts.

Addressing first the specific example provided by the examiner of the display on a remote display of an incrementing jackpot, in this situation there is no cooperation during play of the feature between what is displayed on the remote display and feature images displayed on the gaming machine. All that the remote display displays is the amount that is won when the jackpot winning event occurs. This comment applies to all systems that display current pool and amounts.

Next addressing the display of a bonus symbol as described in US 6,416,409. If the Applicant understands the examiner's reasoning correctly, he is saying that it would be obvious to take the central display described in Peterson to display the bonus symbols described in Jordan.

First, the Applicant submits that the teaching of Peterson and Jordan are not compatible in this respect. Referring to paragraph 10006] of Peterson, an object of the invention is apparent to display historical information. Throughout the description Peterson describes only the display of historical information and not information relating to the current gaming activities of a player. The extent of disclosure of 'current jackpot winning information' referred to in the abstract appears to be an 'optional gambling machine identification generally denoted 72'. Alternatively, 'current jackpot winning

information' may be a reference to the last awarded jackpot, in which case 'historical jackpot winning information' would be a reference to earlier awarded jackpots.

Displaying on a display images that relate to whether a player has won a bonus symbol is not such current or historical information that indicates to onlookers whether a high amount of smaller jackpots are won or whether a lower number of larger jackpots are won, particularly considering the onlooker does not get the benefit of the bonus symbols (see column 2, lines 25 to 31 and column 6, lines 20-24 where Jordan describes only displaying the bonus symbol until the gaming machine becomes inactive for a predetermined amount of time indicating that the current player has left the gaming machine).

In addition, neither Jordan nor Peterson describes anything to indicate that it would be obvious to provide an interrelationship between feature games played on different gaming machines as now defined in amended claim 1. The Applicant notes that the examiner refers to the description in Jordan of a maze game and says that it would be obvious to place the hidden goal of the maze in another location once it is revealed. However, there is no suggestion in Jordan, for example, that the reaching of a goal in the maze by one gaming machine will result in the movement of the marker and a change in the prizes on another gaming machine.

Applicant submits claim 21 is patentable for the reasons set out above.

Claim 2

In addition to the comments made in relation to claim 1, claim 2 as amended requires that the feature outcome is dependent on a selection made by a player and any earlier determinations of a feature outcome.

As described above, neither Jordan nor Peterson describes an earlier feature game affecting the outcome of a subsequent feature game.

This claim therefore claims the combination of the feature outcome on a gaming machine being dependent on a selection made by a player during play of the feature game, and the determination of a feature outcome for one gaming machine affecting a subsequent determination of a feature outcome from other one of the gaming machines. The result is that the player of the feature game has an ability to effect a subsequent determination of a feature outcomes for other gaming machines. Applicant respectfully submit that nothing in the combination of Jordan and Peterson makes this combination of concepts obvious.

Claim 3

This claim has been amended so that the feature game is played' on one gaming machine, while another gaming machine continues normal game play. Applicant is beautifully submits that this clearly distinguishes Jordan, which describes in column 7, lines 43 to 45, which describes each gaming machine individually containing bonus outcomes, but the play of the bonus game is completed simultaneously at each gaming machine (see the description that the bonus award is issued to all of the gaming machines).

Claim 4

This claim has been amended to add that the selection effects what is displayed on a display of the gaming machine and images on the remote display, which is to be recalled from claim 1 are different from the images displayed on the gaming machine.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Jordan nor Peterson describes anything resembling this.

Claims 5 and 6

This claim now requires that the gaming machines in effect compete for a prize. The applicant understands that the examiner is implying into the description by Jordan of the session of chance and ability for a player to make a selection. Applicant respectfully submits that even if this implication can be made, nothing in Jordan (or Peterson) describes the prize associated with a selection being awarded to the first gaming machine at which the selection is received.

Claim 14

Claim 14 has been amended to specify that a sequence is displayed on both a display of a gaming machine and a remote display, the displays including at least certain images that differ between the gaming machine display and the remote display. The Applicant respectfully submits that neither Jordan nor Peterson describe the display of the same sequence of images using different representations on different displays.

Applicant submits that claims 7 to 13, 15 to 20 and 22 to 39 are patentable at least for depending on one or more patentable claims.

Claims 40 to 45

Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least for the following reasons:

Neither Jordan nor Peterson describes or renders obvious the simultaneous display of different representations of the same sequence on a gaming machine display and a remote display, with the sequence showing the result of a player selection and with a

gaming machine display showing an enlarged representation of at least a portion of the sequence of images as defined in claim 40.

Neither Jordan nor Peterson describes or renders obvious a gaming system where gaming machines individually enter and play a feature game, can simultaneously play the feature game, and representations associated with each gaming machine are simultaneously displayed on a remote display.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in order for allowance over the cited art of record.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account of MHM, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 17, 2007

/Christopher N. George/
Christopher N. George
Reg. No. 51,728

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100